ADDENDUM NUMBER SEVEN

TO

JPL REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) NUMBER SCO-552785

FOR

FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS SERVICES AT JPL

OCTOBER 23rd, 2002

Except as specifically modified herein, this RFP remains unchanged.

Proposers are reminded that receipt of this Addendum must be acknowledged on Attachment A-1 to the RFP.

Questions received through 12:00 Noon on Wednesday, October 23, 2002 are addressed in this Addendum. If an answer to a question has not yet been developed, the question is so noted.

A. New/Updated Appendices.

All proposers are advised that JPL is issuing new Appendix 11.2 with this Addendum. Appendix 11.2 provides historical data for Grounds (G), Programmed Maintenance (PGM), Replacement of Obsolete Items (ROI), and Space Flight Operations Facility (SFOF) work.

This Addendum also provides an updated version of Appendix 15.9, Janitorial Maintenance Schedules.

B. Questions received between October 16th, 2002 and October 23rd, 2002

1 Reference and background information: Maximo data for FY 99 through 02 provided by Appendices 14.6, 14.7, 14.8, and 14.9, historical data of trouble calls provided by Appendix 11.1, and historical data of repairs provided by Appendix 12.1. The workload provided by Appendices 14.6, 14.7, 14.8, and 14.9 for work order types of SFOF, ROI, and G does not appear to be included in the workload of Appendix 11.1 and 12.1. This workload is significant with 5,484 SFOF work orders, 114 ROI work orders and 8,740 G work orders for the four years of Maximo data. Most of the descriptions of the work orders types of SFOF, ROI, and G appear to fit the definition of a trouble call provided by attachment 11 and enclosure 1.

Question 1a: Is there a reason that the work order types of SFOF, ROI, and G listed in Appendices 14.6, 14.7, 14.8, and 14.9 are excluded from the historical data of trouble calls Appendix 11.1 and historical data of repairs Appendix 12.1?

Answer: The reason that SFOF, ROI and G type work is not included in Appendix 11.1, Historical Data of Trouble Calls and Appendix 12.1, Historical Data of Repairs, is that they are not classified as Trouble Calls or Repairs in the NASA Work Element types. This is why JPL

provided proposers with Appendices 14.6, 14.7, 14.8 and 14.9, which includes but is not limited to the data provided in Appendix 11.1 and Appendix 12.1.

Question 1b: If work order types of SFOF, ROI, and G are not considered trouble calls or repairs what are they considered? Should offerors include staffing above and beyond the staffing for trouble calls and repairs in their proposals to perform SFOF, ROI, and G tasks?

Answer: Offerors should include staffing for SFOF, ROI and G work types in addition to staffing for all other work types described in this RFP. Please see the lower portion of the data table provided in Appendix 11.1 for a breakdown by trade, which should provide the proposers with an insight as to what work types may have been treated as Trouble Calls or as Repairs. Please note CPO is synonymous with SFOF in this table.

Question 1c: Can JPL identify the average time required to complete each SFOF, ROI, and G work order, response and completion times required for the work orders (if any) and define the historical skills required to perform the work similar to the format shown in Appendix 11.1 and 12.1 for trouble calls and repairs?

Answer: Please see Appendix 11.2, Historical Data of Work of Type SFOF, ROI and G and PGM.

2 Reference and background: Maximo data for FY 99 through 02 provided by Appendices 14.6, 14.7, 14.8, and 14.9, historical data of trouble calls provided by Appendix 11.1, and historical data of repairs provided by Appendix 12.1. Many of the work orders listed in Appendices 14.6, 14.7, 14.8, and 14.9 as work order type PGM do not appear to be programmed maintenance work (PGM) as defined by the RFP enclosure 1 which indicates programmed maintenance is recurring work items with maintenance cycles greater than one year. A significant number of the 4,322 PGM type work orders appear to be trouble calls including tasks to drain fire sprinkler system and perform touch up painting and others appear to be discretionary tasks outside of the scope of the RFP such as hang white board, replace carpet, clean mall glass in front and remove and rehang two flip top wall cabinets.

Question 2a: Is there a reason that the work order types of PGM listed in Appendices 14.6, 14.7, 14.8, and 14.9 that appear to be trouble calls or repairs are excluded from the historical data of trouble calls Appendix 11.1 and historical data of repairs Appendix 12.1?

Answer: Proposers are reminded that this M&O RFP deviates significantly from the manner in which the present contract is executed. Some of the items cited in the discussion above are typically Trouble Calls and some are outside the scope of this RFP.

Question 2b: If the work order type PGM is not considered trouble calls or repairs what are those tasks listed in Appendices 14.6, 14.7, 14.8, and 14.9 that appear to be one time repair occurrences or one time additional services originated by the building occupants considered? Should offerors include staffing in their proposal to perform all or some of the listed PGM tasks?

Answer: Proposers are encouraged to make their own inferences as to the nature of individual work requests shown in Appendixes 14.6, 14.7, 14.8 and 14.9 and appropriately structure their proposals to reflect their understanding of the work required in the statement of work.

Question 2c: Can JPL identify the average time required to complete each of PGM work order, response and completion times required for the work orders (if any) and define the historical

skills required to perform the work similar to the format shown in Appendix 11.1 and 12.1 for trouble calls and repairs?

Answer: Please see Answer to Question 1C, above.

3 Reference and background: Maximo data for FY 99 through 02 provided by Appendices 14.6, 14.7, 14.8, and 14.9, historical data of trouble calls provided by Appendix 11.1, and historical data of repairs provided by Appendix 12.1. Some of the work orders listed in Appendices 14.6, 14.7, 14.8, and 14.9 as work order type PM do not appear to be preventive maintenance work (PM). A small but significant number of the 22,059 PM type work orders appear to be trouble calls including tasks to replace belts, clean clogged roof gutter, dispatch Bill Brown to snake out main sewer line, install vibration cables to motor & bearings, repair leaks in valve packing. All of these tasks that do not appear to be PM do not identify the equipment number in the EQNUM column. The total number of PMs listed each year increase progressively starting with 2,877 work orders in FY 1999, then 5,033 in FY 2000, then 5,767 in 2001 and then to 8,379 in FY 2002.

Question 3a: Is there a reason that the work order types of PM listed in Appendices 14.6, 14.7, 14.8, and 14.9 that appear to be repairs are excluded from the historical data of trouble calls Appendix 11.1 and historical data of repairs Appendix 12.1?

Answer: Proposers are reminded that this M&O RFP deviates significantly from the manner in which the present contract is executed. Some of the items cited in the discussion above are typically Trouble Calls. Also, Please see Answer to Question 2B, above.

Question 3b: Are we correct in assuming that the PM work orders listed in Appendices 14.6, 14.7, 14.8, and 14.9 are not indicative of the PM workload defined by the RFP and that we can expect the PM workload to remain relatively constant for all contract years?

Answer: Please see Answer to Question 2B, above.

Question 3c: Can JPL identify the average time required to complete each PM work order and define the historical skills required to perform the work similar to the format shown in Appendix 11.1 and 12.1 for trouble calls and repairs?

Answer: Proposers are encouraged to make their own inferences as to the nature of individual PM work requirements shown in Appendixes 15.1 through 15.14 and appropriately structure their proposals to reflect their understanding of the work required in the statement of work.

4 Reference and background information: Question 109 of addendum number three and Exhibit 3B wage determination No. 1986-0879, revision 10. Exhibit 3B under the heading "notes applying to this wage determination" indicates that the duties of employees under job titles listed are those described in the "Service Contract Act Directory of Occupations". A review of the Service Contract Act Directory of Occupations did not identify a position description for the Certified Service Journeyman and Service Journeyman. The note also indicates copies of specific job descriptions may also be obtained from the appropriate contracting officer. The response to question 109 indicates JPL does not have a position description for these service categories. The wages and benefits for the Certified Service Journeyman and Service Journeyman are significantly higher than the wages and benefits for other craftsmen with similar skills making a full understanding of the position description critical to fully complying with the Service Contract Act while still offering JPL a competitive price proposal.

Question 4: Who is the appropriate contracting officer, referred to in the wage determination, that can provide a copy of the of the position description for the Certified Service Journeyman and Service Journeyman?

Answer: Steve Ogle, the Cognizant Negotiator, will be the point of contact for issues related to Wage Determinations.

5 Reference and background information: Specimen contract Article 1 paragraph 4.1.3, Exhibit 3C collective bargaining agreement (CBA) between Servicon Systems Inc and LIUNA and LIUNA Local 882 covering JPL, Standard Form 98 notice of intention to make a service contract and response to notice and Question 3 Addendum 3. It appears that the Department of labor has not yet responded to JPL's submission of Standard Form 98 and attached a wage determination that applies to the procurement. Paragraph 4.1.3 refers to Exhibit 3C as the collective bargaining agreement (CBA) between Laborer's International Union of North America Local #882 and Servicon Systems, Inc, constituting the wage determination for janitorial services at JPL. The answer to question 3 Addendum 3 indicated updates to wage determinations will be provided to offerors when received.

Question 5a: Does JPL intend for offerors to prepare price proposals as if the Department of Labor has actually issued a wage determination incorporating exhibit 3C or would JPL prefer offerors to use the Department of Labor issued Enclosure 3D, Wage Determination No. 1994-2047, rev. 18 (all others) to price those occupations not covered by any other issued Department of Labor wage determination such as janitors?

Answer: Exhibit 3C is the response provided from the Department of Labor to JPL's original SF-98 request.

Question 5b: Will the offerors be provided a copy of the wage determination prior to contract award so that they may read and understand the issued wage determination and comply with all Service Contract Act requirements relating to the occupations covered by the wage determination incorporating the collective bargaining agreement?

Answer: JPL intends to provide updated Wage Determinations for all labor categories to all proposers in the competitive range prior to source selection.

6 Reference: Appendix 15.9. Appendix 15.9 page 5 under the header "Weekly Basis" has the following requirement. All flooring shall be swept and damp mopped daily.

Question 6: Please clarify the desired frequency for sweeping and damp mopping J-2 area floors. Does JPL desire daily or weekly service?

Answer: Appendix 15.9 has been revised to reflect the requirement of sweeping and damp mopping all J-2 floor areas on a weekly basis. Corrections have been shown in red type.

7 Reference: Answer to Question 86 of addendum 3 identifying the historical "finds" documented and corrected during predictive testing and inspections.

Question 7: Are the 200+ historical "finds" per year included in the trouble calls listed in Appendix 11.1 or in addition to the trouble calls listed?

Answer: No.

8 Reference: RFP general instruction paragraph 2.1.2.4 limiting type font size to no smaller than 10-point character height.

Question 8: Does the limitation of 10-point font apply only to text or also to font used within figures? Many times figures can be more effective with smaller font size in some portions of the figure. May font in figures be smaller than 10 point?

Answer: The font size limitation applies to all text.

9 Reference: Reference appendix 15.14 items 1 and 2 and attachment 2.

Question 9: How many workstations and servers require semi-annual service?

Answer: Proposers are referred to Appendix 38.1.

10 Reference: Reference appendix 15.9 page 4.

Question 10: Can JPL define the square footage hi-net/computer server rooms that require Bi-Annual cleaning?

Answer: JPL does not have this data.

11 Reference: Reference appendix 15.4 items 5, 6 and 18 and attachment 2.

Question 11: How many emergency lanterns and exit lights require service every two months? How many emergency fluorescent battery packs require Biennial service?

Answer: JPL is working to develop some data in this regard. A response will be provided with the next Addendum.

12 Reference: Reference Appendix 15.3, Section 5.2 "Magna-flux all hooks, hanger rods and load lifting devices."

It would be beneficial for pricing purposes to better understand the inventory of "lifting devices" the contractor will be responsible for maintaining.

Question 12: Could JPL provide the inventory of "lifting devices" and a count of hanger rods that require magna-flux inspection? Magna-flux testing is very expensive and the contractor will need an accurate equipment count. Also, how many of these items are painted because they will need to be stripped for testing and then repainted.

Answer: Proposers are referred to Appendix 22.1, List of Cranes and Hoists.